

Serial No.: 10/748,487  
Group Art Unit: 2616

### REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-26 are now pending in this application, with claims 1, 12 and 23 being independent claims. Claim 13 was previously canceled. Claim 3 is currently amended.

### In The Claims

In the present official action, independent claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al., US Patent No. 6,567,408, ("Li"). Applicants previously amended independent claim 12 and respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 as now presented are not anticipated by Li.

In particular, claim 1 includes the element of "selecting an action from a plurality of actions based on the first index *and* the second index, each action being associated with two or more indices of the plurality of indices" (emphasis added), while claim 12 includes the element "a memory device, operatively coupled to the index allocator, comprising a plurality of actions, *each* being selected based on *two* or more indices from the plurality of indices" (emphasis added).

In contrast, Li discloses selecting an action only based upon one of the indices, not both (Li, column 10, lines 33-35) "Table 60 has a pointer 66 corresponding to *the* entry or 116.190.\*.\* which points to the second level table 62B." Clearly, in Li, the action is based only upon one a single index chosen, not upon two chosen indices.

Li discloses (in the relevant portion cited by the Examiner, col. 10, lines 27-40) a src string and a dst string which the Examiner asserts corresponds with the first string and the second string of claim 1 and claim 12. In Li, the src string is used to identify the table 62B which Examiner asserts corresponds with the first index of claim 1 and claim 12. The dst string of Li is then directly compared to the entries in the first index 62B and action B is selected. No second index, as required in claims 1 and 12, is ever even utilized in Li.

As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Li, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Serial No.: 10/748,487  
Group Art Unit: 2616

In the present official action, independent claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yazaki et al., US Patent No. 6,768,738, ("Yazaki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and assert that claim 23 is not anticipated by Yazaki. In particular, claim 23 includes the element of "*generating* a first string from source information associated with the PDU" (emphasis added).

In contrast, Yazaki does not disclose "generating a first string," rather it discloses utilizing existing header information, and not generating a first string (Yazaki, column 15, lines 38-40). In other words, no strings are generated at all in Yazaki, which instead simply utilizes the existing header information.

As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Yazaki, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 23 is patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of claims 2-11, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Claim 3 has also been amended to remove the source address and destination address as potential fields. Although these fields should also be permissible if the rejection of claim 1 is withdrawn based on the foregoing arguments, the removal of these fields avoids the Li reference which only discloses these types of fields.

Regarding the rejections of claims 14-22, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 12, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of claims 24-26, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 23, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 23, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 10/748,487  
Group Art Unit: 2616

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, the previous amendments and remarks place the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned attorney at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Dated: March 17, 2008

Raymond M. Galasso, Reg. No. 37,832

Correspondence Address:  
Alcatel Lucent  
c/o Galasso & Associates, LP  
P.O. Box 26503  
Austin, TX 78755-0503